Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/645,375	BALLINGER ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Martin Jeriko P. San Juan	2132

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) *Martin Jeriko P. San Juan (USPTO Examiner)*.　　(3)*J. Lavar Oldham (Applicant's Representative)*.

(2) *Gilberto Barron, Jr. (USPTO SPE)*.　　　　　　(4)_____.

Date of Interview: *30 October 2007*.

Type:　a)☒ Telephonic　b)☐ Video Conference
　　　　c)☐ Personal [copy given to:　1)☐ applicant　　2)☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted:　d)☐ Yes　e)☒ No.
　If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: *1 and 14*.

Identification of prior art discussed: *de Jong et al. [US 2004/0054628]*.

Agreement with respect to the claims f)☐ was reached.　g)☒ was not reached.　h)☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: *See Continuation Sheet*.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

_____
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: A general summary about the Applicant's invention was discussed. Also, the security tokens in relation to a custom program that the receiving computer would need access to process/handle the message has been discussed. Limitations regarding the value type of the token and its corresponding stored value type were discussed and elaborated by the Applicant. As amended, it appears that the value type with regard to its custom property is not taught by de Jong. Further consideration by the Examiner is needed to determine whether de Jong still teaches the limitations with regard to the custom property.